

djj

1

DJJ

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
STATEMENT FOR THE  
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE CONSOLIDATION

Thursday, April 30, 1998

Alexandria City Hall  
Alexandria, Virginia

The hearing in the above-entitled matter was convened, pursuant to notice, 7:39 p.m.

BEFORE:

For the General Services Administration:

CARL WINTERS, Project Manager

For the Patent and Trademark Office:

RUTH NYBLOOD

djj

2

C O N T E N T S

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction: Carl Winters, GSA	3
Speakers:	
Kerry Donley	10
Robert Jordan	16
Larry Grossman	20
Katy Cannady	21
Judy McVay	24
Poul Hertel	26
Nicholas C. Yost	29
Ellen Pickering	43
Judy Miller	54
Michael Perine	57
Allan Kamerow	60
Ray Whitney	65
Bill Hard	68

djj

3

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Good evening; thank you for coming to our public hearing tonight. I'm Carl Winters from the General Services Administration, GSA, National Capital Region, and I'm the GSA project manager for the Patent and Trademark Office, PTO, consolidation project. GSA is the procurement agent for this project, and as such, we must see that the project complies with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, commonly called NEPA, as well as the National Historical Preservation Act, specifically Section 106 of NHPA.

To satisfy all of the former and portions of the latter, GSA is preparing the environmental impact statement, EIS, for this project. Almost one year ago, on June 4 at Aurora Hills and June 5 at the Alexandria City Hall, GSA initiated the EIS project in the public scoping meetings. It was at that time, in the consolidation project, that the Government knew which alternative sites would be competing in the second phase of the procurement of up to 2.4 million rentable square feet of leased

djj

4

space for the PTO.

The comments from those two public meetings, along with submitted written comments, were used as guidance for investigation of specific issues that respondents wanted to be included in a study of impacts to the environment that may be caused by our project. The draft environmental impact statement, DEIS, was then prepared under GSA contract by a team of consultants led by EDAW, Inc., utilizing the specific recommendations of the public scoping process as well as general knowledge of standard EIS content and scope.

The time it took for preparing this DEIS was lengthened by the demands of our procurement. The specific designs for each offer were not known until late October of 1997, and there were subsequent iterations with all of the offerors to make sure that we had the correct information to include in the DEIS.

The DEIS was released on April 3, 1998, for a 45-calendar day comment period that started officially on April 10 and ends on May 26, 1998.

djj

5

This public meeting is another part of the EIS process. We are here to listen to your comments on the DEIS. Your comments will be addressed in the final environmental impact statement, FEIS. If you don't wish to speak tonight, you may submit written comments, postmarked no later than May 26, 1998.

The comments can also come via facsimile or email but no later than May 26.

We estimate that it will take until the first part of August 1998 to collect and incorporate your comments, review, print and release the FEIS. At the release of the FEIS, there will be a 30-calendar day no action period. At the end of this no action period, a record of decision, ROD, will be prepared that explains GSA's decision on the project.

Due to procurement sensitivities, the ROD will be released simultaneously with lease award, which is scheduled for October 1998.

The primary purposes of an EIS are, one, to provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and, two, to inform decision

djj

6

makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which could avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. By itself, the EIS is not a decision making document. Rather, it is one tool that the Government will use to make the final decision regarding which offer is successful.

The offers are also being evaluated on site infrastructure and public transportation availability, proposed building designs, architectural development and operation and maintenance teams and price, among other factors.

The EIS addresses several topics, including earth resources, land use and planning, socioeconomic resources, cultural and aesthetic resources, transportation impacts, environmental, health and urban systems. Each of these is analyzed in the separate phases of, one, preoccupancy, which are the existing conditions; two, during construction; and, three, post-occupancy.

There are numerous Federal, state and

djj

7

local agencies in addition to the general public that will review and comment on the EIS to ensure that the document conforms with environmental and historic preservation standards and goals. I have now given you a sketch of what an EIS is and the purpose it serves, described the EIS process, where we are in that process and the schedule to complete and briefly touched on some of the procurement steps that have occurred.

As you may have noticed, there is one less site discussed in the DEIS than we proposed in the public scoping meetings last year. On March 18, 1998, Potomac Yards withdrew from the competition. Therefore, there are currently three alternative sites under consideration: one, Crystal City in Arlington County; two, Carlyle; and, three, Eisenhower Avenue, both in Alexandria. The EIS also addresses the no action alternative.

Anyone can speak tonight to comment on the draft EIS, but you must first sign in on the speaker sheet located at the entrance of the room. Speakers will be called in the order they signed

djj

8

in. Also, please take time to inspect the presentation boards stationed around the room. These are enlarged versions of the graphics included in the DEIS, and there are copies of the DEIS available at the back of the room, but please be sure to sign for those so that we know who obtained copies.

Now, I'd like to introduce Ruth Nyblood of PTO.

MS. NYBLOOD: Thank you; good evening. My name is Ruth Nyblood; I'm with the Patent and Trademark Office, the Office of Public Affairs and thank you all very much for coming this evening.

For those of you who aren't familiar with the Patent and Trademark Office, it's a bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The mission of the Patent and Trademark Office is to enhance industrial and technological progress in the United States by promoting the use of intellectual property rights--that's patents, trademarks and copyrights--as a means of achieving economic prosperity. The Patent and Trademark Office does

djj

9

this by processing patent applications--over 120,000 patents were granted last year; registering trademarks--more than 112,000 were registered last year; and disseminating patent and trademark information to the public.

The Patent and Trademark Office, unlike most Government agencies, is entirely funded by user fees. Therefore, we have a unique responsibility to ensure that users receive efficient, cost-effective services and products that meet their needs and expectations.

I'm here tonight to listen to your views and to ensure that they are known to the assistant secretary of commerce and commissioner of patents and trademarks. I'm also here to assure you that the Patent and Trademark Office prides itself on being a good neighbor and will work with citizens in whatever community we are located to always be a good neighbor.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: For the meeting tonight, the Government is here to listen. We are

djj

10

not here to present findings, nor are we here to debate or resolve issues that you may raise tonight. We will take all of the issues that you raise into consideration and see that they are addressed in the FEIS. We are not here to answer any specific questions except for the review process itself, nor will we discuss the procurement in any more detail.

We are ensuring that our comments are recorded by having a transcriber here to record your verbal testimony. The transcript of tonight's meeting will be included in the final EIS. We will also take any written comments that you may want to enter into the record tonight, and when you come up to speak, when I call your name, would you spell your last name for the transcriber, please?

So, we'll begin with the first speaker on the sign-in sheet, which is Kerry Donley.

MR. DONLEY: Good evening. My name is Kerry Donley, last name spelled D-O-N-L-E-Y, and I'm the mayor of the City of Alexandria, and first off, I want to thank you for coming here tonight

djj

11

and having this meeting to receive comments on the draft EIS. We are happy to play host here in city hall to GSA and PTO.

Let me just say for the record that the City of Alexandria is fully supportive of the Patent and Trademark Office relocating to the City of Alexandria. We have worked with many of the developers and the companies involved relative to the two sites. Now, Alexandria has not stated and taken a formal endorsement of the other two sites that are here in the City of Alexandria, but we do wish that the procurement process proceed as scheduled, with an anticipated decision in October, and I do want you to know that the city has taken at least a formal action in supporting the PTO's relocation here and has not expressed an interest or a preference on any of the two sites.

I do want to take an opportunity to give you at least my opinion of some of the elements in the EIS and how they relate to the two sites here in the City of Alexandria. Both of these sites are located on the southern edge of Alexandria's

**Comment  
Noted**

djj

12

border, both in relative proximity to the Eisenhower Valley: the Hoffman complex, directly located in the Eisenhower Valley and the Carlyle project, which is to the east of--the east end of the Eisenhower Valley.

Millions of public dollars and private dollars as well have been invested in the Eisenhower Valley to mitigate flood projects, to enhance transportation access to the valley and make the valley a pleasing place for development. We believe that the valley is now ripe for a development of this magnitude, and we are fully supportive of the procurement as it goes forward.

As you know, the Washington area is a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide. Under the Clean Air Act, it is incumbent upon all of us to ensure that vehicular transportation and emissions from automobiles is minimized to the greatest extent possible. The Eisenhower Valley here in the City of Alexandria, home of these two sites, offers a unique opportunity for people to get out of their cars, minimize the impact on air pollution as well

9.1-1

djj

13

as accompanying traffic congestion and use mass transportation.

I mentioned earlier that millions of dollars have been invested in the infrastructure of the Eisenhower Valley, but I do also want to state that the Eisenhower Valley here in Alexandria offers, I think, PTO a unique opportunity to be a leader in terms of usage of mass transportation. Eisenhower Valley is the home or the convergence of many difficult modes of transportation. It is adequately served by two Metrorail stations: the King Street Station as well as the Eisenhower Station, located directly on Eisenhower Avenue.

8.6-1

In addition, the valley is also served by Virginia Railway Express, which could accommodate many of the commuters otherwise taking a single-occupant car on light rail transportation, which I think is a unique opportunity here in Alexandria. We are also served by major routes of transportation: the Capital Beltway, Route 1, enhanced transportation access to the Capital Beltway at the Eisenhower interchange as well as

djj

14

the Telegraph Road interchange and the Van Dorn interchange to the far west serve the valley and will enhance transportation and avoid the congestion that I believe presently exists primarily on Route 1, which travels through the heart of the city and is really the only major route of transportation that serves the current location at Crystal City.

8.6-2

All things being considered, in terms of the environmental impact, particularly that of traffic congestion and air quality, the Eisenhower Valley offers, I believe, PTO a unique opportunity to get people out of their cars in a planned, coordinated development that would provide, number one, an efficient use of PTO time and resources, which is, in many cases, dollars to many of the citizens throughout the United States. But, number two, it will also help us here in the region attain some of the traffic management goals and emissions goals that are going to be required by the Clean Air Act.

Getting people out of their cars is an

djj

15

important goal here in the City of Alexandria, and by relocating Patent and Trademark to the Eisenhower corridor in either one of these sites will give us an opportunity to use different modes of transportation: Metrorail, DASH bus, Metrobus as well as the Fairfax County Connector, Virginia Railway Express as well as the interchanges that currently serve the valley, thereby eliminating much of the traffic congestion that we experience here in the City of Alexandria here on Route 1 each and every day.

8.6-1

To sum up, I believe that the PTO will find Alexandria to be not only a friendly neighbor but a very efficient and effective neighbor in terms of its overall mission. I also believe that the environmental impacts of development of this capacity are best served by the City of Alexandria through the infrastructure investments that have been made to serve the Eisenhower Valley, primarily through mass transportation, both bus and rail, light rail, with Virginia Railway Express.

Again, on behalf of the city council, I

djj

16

welcome you here tonight. I also appreciate your tough decision, and if there's any way the city can help you make that decision in any way, we stand ready to assist you.

Thank you very much for coming tonight, and I wish you a good evening.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

MR. DONLEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Bob Jordan.

MR. JORDAN: Robert Jordan, J-O-R-D-A-N; I'm a resident of Carlyle Towers, one of the early pioneers to be a resident in the Eisenhower corridor, and we signed a contract with IDI. We were on the very first more than 4 years ago, and we were led to believe, and now, I look back and think how innocent I was, but we were led to believe that this was a very serious agreement that was undertaken between the city and Carlyle Development in, I think, 1992, in terms of the mix of residential and office, the quality of life, the continuation of the healthy, vibrant mix that has made Old Town such a destination point, retail,

djj

17

office and residential.

And I've learned just in the last few days that civic associations at that time endorsed this development because there was going to be the continuation of that healthy mix, and that was part of--that was a very important part of the considerations that we made. We tried--you know, we all think that we're intelligent people, and we tried to make an intelligent decision.

5.2-6

Now, I don't know. I don't know about our investment, when we're going to see in front of us a 155-foot Berlin Wall that will completely cut off higher than was originally intended, agreed to by the original 1992, I guess it's called--I haven't been a civic activist; you'll have to pardon me. This is new to me. And of course, this skyscraper--and so, I'm aroused. I'm worried about what the precedent this will have.

7.2-7

I know, I understand--the developers--we heard the presentation of the developers last week, and I understand that, yes, they say that the mix will revert back to the 1992 agreement, but I've

djj

18

learned since then, I've learned, become more sophisticated, that that agreement is like a sieve. Variances can be made; modifications can be made. I understand--I'm aware--that the city, at the present time, is very--is, for the first time in many years, is feeling a lot of pressure on money, on taxes. They're very interested in getting the revenue.

The revenue from an office construction will be much more of a plus than residential construction and will greatly help their present budget. On the subject of transportation, already, I can see from my window that Duke Street is gridlocked during rush hour. We're talking about 7,500 workers at PTO, eventually 7,500. I understand there are not quite that many now; 3,500 cars. What is going to be that impact?

I've made a point--I'm a representative resident on the Board of Directors of the Eisenhower Partnership, and I've made a special point of talking to these people who have had a lot more experience than I have had--an enormous amount

8.1-4

djj

19

more--and talking to city officials about this transportation, about this access to Duke Street.

There is no real good answer to this, and I'm worried; yes, I very strongly endorse--all my life, I've been a strong endorser of public transportation rather than mass transportation, and this was part of the original concept here. But is that part of the original concept now with space from the two huge garages for 3,500 cars? I just--you know, that's the reality, and this is only half--something like half of the eventual or half or less of the eventual residents or occupiers of offices in the 76 acres of Carlyle.

2-2

So, that's very much of a concern to me. I wonder if you have looked at the actual design of the Carlyle site. What it looks like, it looks like a fortress. It's focused inward. It is not--it does not look user-friendly. In contrast, I like the look, the feeling of the Hoffman site.

7.2-7

And on the subject of sites, I understand that we can speak about the Crystal City site as well. I'm appalled. I mean, your drawings here

djj

20

are far superior to what I saw--I saw the presentation by the Hoffman people and by the Elcorp people. This is far superior.

And this is just shocking, what I see there in Crystal City. I mean, I can't believe that this could happen, this kind of invasion of the Parkway. I mean, to me, that's something sacred. It's been--it was conceived as a scenic driveway. It was not conceived as a commuter route, and this would be the first violation of that, going back 60 years.

7.2-2

I guess that's as much as I can think of saying.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Okay; thank you very much.

MR. JORDAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Larry Grossman.

MR. GROSSMAN: My name is Larry Grossman, G-R-O-S-S-M-A-N, and I really, essentially have one comment, that I notice that under the Crystal City proposal that the proposed building that would be closest to the parkway would go over the CSX rail

djj

21

tracks, and, therefore, freight trains would be passing underneath the building, and the EIS does not address that issue from a security perspective, possible derailments, the cargo that might be carried by those freight trains, which could include hazardous materials.

11-1

And I thought that the reason why the garages were separated from the buildings was because of security, and it was surprising to see that freight trains would be allowed to run underneath the building.

I also did not see in the EIS the location of the building, that is, the distance of the building from the parkway, just as a point of clarification, whether it's at the edge of the Park Service property, or is there a setback. So, I would like that clarified. And those are my comments; thank you.

7.2-3

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

Michael Perrine?

MR. PERRINE: I'm going to pass for now.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Okay.

djj

22

Katy Cannady.

MS. CANNADY: I'm Katy Cannady. Cannady is C-A-N-N-A-D-Y.

I live in the Rosemont neighborhood, which is very near to the Carlyle site. I want to talk about two of these sites.

In relation to what I might call community sentiment in Alexandria, a long-standing community sentiment, as Mr. Jordan mentioned in relation to the Crystal City site, this town regards the parkway as very special--all of us, whether we live near it or not. It's very important to us that the parkway remain a tree-lined route to George Washington's house. I have out-of-town guests this week, and I'm planning to take them along the parkway.

7.2-2

And even though I don't live very near it, I would like it to remain tree-lined and as pristine as it can be in the late Twentieth Century, and I think the building, the design of the building at Crystal City is much too near to the parkway, and for that reason, I would prefer

djj

23

that site not be the chosen one.

But even more than that, the Carlyle site is a problem. In Rosemont, the Masons, who own the George Washington Masonic Temple, graciously allow us to use their grounds as a park, and the people in Rosemont and Taylor Run do that, and it's important to us to have a nice view from our park, even though we don't own our park.

It used to be the plan in this town that we would not have buildings, tall buildings, near to the Masonic Temple. Now, we've already somewhat violated that at the Carlyle site. Some tall buildings are already there. But I'm sure your EIS, this representation at figure 4.4.2-10(b) is a good--I work for the Government, too--

7.2-4

[Laughter.]

MS. CANNADY: --is a good representation of what that building would look like, and it's enough to have a nightmare over, even just drawn in. It's much too near to the parkway. It's much too near to the Masonic Temple, which we regard as park land. It's much too near to Old Town, and it

djj

24

impinges on a part of the city that we would hope would stay as it is as much as possible.

In addition, we're all for mixed-use development, and, as Mr. Jordan mentioned, adding a very large office complex to that area would make it very difficult to maintain it as a mixed use development as was planned.

5.2-6

So, my personal preference would be the Eisenhower Avenue site. No one that I know of has any sentimental or emotional attachment to Eisenhower Avenue.

[Laughter.]

MS. CANNADY: And I don't think anyone in this city would be a bit bothered by having another large, even ugly building there. It fits right in.

7.2-8

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

[Laughter.]

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Judy McVay?

MS. MCVAY: My name is Judy McVay, that's M-C-V-A-Y. I'm president of the Old Town Civic Association, and I'm here to ask you to exclude the

djj

25

Crystal City site for the Patent and Trademark Office to protect our national monument, the George Washington Parkway, from this huge project.

7.2-2

One of the most profound environmental impacts of this project will be on the GW Parkway, and yet, I cannot find in the draft EIS how far from the edge of the parkway the buildings will be. This is basic information that should have been included in the environmental impact study. The fact that it isn't says that the draft for this site is seriously flawed. Obviously, any building going up on that site and straddling the railroad tracks is going to be very close to the parkway.

7.2-3

We who live along the parkway corridor have a particular interest in and respect for the historical aspects of this beautiful drive. This is, as I said before, a national monument and should be treasured and respected as such. To allow development to further erode the scenic beauty of this parkway should not be the legacy left to future generations.

Thank you.

djj

26

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

Poul Hertel.

MR. HERTEL: My name is Poul Hertel, and that's spelled first name P-O-U-L, second name H-E-R-T-E-L.

The guidelines call for a considerable complex consisting of 2.4 million rentable square feet with at least 3,500 parking places, accommodating an on-site employee/contractor population of about 7,100. A site of such a magnitude must be carefully be deliberated to ensure compliance with Federal guidelines concerning the historic preservation laws and procedures.

7.2-7

The draft environmental impact statement identifies several areas of controversy, one of which is the effect on the historical and visual resources, including the George Washington Memorial Parkway, affected by the Crystal City site and the George Washington Masonic Memorial, affected by the Carlyle site.

7.2-4

Under the Federal facilities section of

djj

27

the Federal elements, the National Planning Council has adopted several objectives relevant to the proposed PTO project, page 3-6 of the draft EIS. One of these states to ensure that the Federal facilities are compatible with their surroundings and make a positive contribution to their environment. This can be found on page 3-16. The Crystal City site violates this criterion, a point omitted in the draft EIS. A cursory review of the historical background of the history of the George Washington Memorial Parkway reveals why.

7.2-5

The George Washington Memorial Parkway is the only significant historical feature near the Crystal City PTO site. It has been recognized worldwide as one of the finest gateways to a major city. The parkway concept originated in America by nineteenth-century landscape architects, and the Washington National Memorial Parkway was the first in the nation and was completed in 1932 to commemorate the bicentennial of George Washington's birth.

The intent was to develop a historic and

djj

28

scenic venue, preserving and emphasizing the natural beauty between George Washington's tomb and Mount Vernon and Washington, D.C. The George Washington Memorial Parkway is, by its very inception, public land that is held in trust by the National Park Service for the specific purpose of maintaining the integrity of the natural beauty along the route.

7.1-6

The proposed PTO in Crystal City would extend east from the existing buildings in Crystal City at an average of 175 feet above the railroad tracks. The computer-generated graphics on page 456 and 457 of the draft EIS clearly depict the visual impact of this building on the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The effect is noticeable and profound and can only be marginally mitigated through cosmetic and natural means because of the proximity of the proposed building to the pavement itself.

7.2-2

Furthermore, the Crystal City site suffers from a serious deficiency concerning safety aspects. One of the GSA guidelines called for the

djj

29

above-grade parking to mitigate the potential for terrorist bombings. For the building to be built over the railroad is inherently unsafe according to this criterion, because it is built on top of a de facto tunnel, a tunnel which would provide ample opportunity for maximum damage from a terrorist attack.

11-1

Finally, in order to build on top of the railroad, the permission of the track owners, CSX, is required. Do the developers of the Crystal City site, in fact, have this permission?

3-5

I eagerly anticipate a reply to my inquiry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

[Pause.]

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Nicholas Yost?

MR. YOST: Thank you again for your courtesy.

I'm Nicholas Yost, Y-O-S-T, and I am here representing the Charles E. Smith Companies. I'm with the law firm of Sonnenschein, Nath and Rosenthal.

djj

30

Let me start with four preliminary observations. First, we will put in more detailed comments by the May 26 deadline, but you have our initial comments. Secondly and overall, the current DEIS is characterized not so much by misdirection as by omission and by failure to take the hard look demanded by the National Environmental Policy Act. Time and again, important issues are briefly mentioned but, then, neither explored nor their implications fully examined. As it now stands, the DEIS has a long way to go before it becomes a legally defensible document.

1-1

Indeed, the shortcomings of the DEIS in several critical respects are such as to preclude meaningful analysis and require a revised draft EIS to be prepared and circulated for comment prior to proceeding to a final EIS.

Third, it's worth noting that GSA, in drafting this document, is not writing on a blank slate. GSA has earlier prepared NEPA documents in connection with the same or similar sites where

1-5

djj

31

assertions have been made about environmental impacts when then have to be compared with those in the current GSA NEPA documents, and, as I will return to this, that raises questions.

Fourth, and just by way of further introduction, I might also add that as general counsel of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, I drafted the Federal Government's NEPA regulations, under which GSA is proceeding and under which its performance will ultimately be judged. There will be five parts to this presentation, which I will curtail and only summarize the points. We will deal with structural failings under NEPA, hazardous waste, traffic, archaeology and land use.

Taking them one by one: structural failings; any environmental impact statement is premised on its statement of purpose and need. The very purpose for which is undertaking an action, and then, you look at the alternatives for getting that action accomplished or getting to that end; but if the purpose and need is itself--has

2-1

djj

32

shortcomings, that has the effect of undermining the entire document. In this case, the DEIS appears to posit four needs to which the agency is responding: the Americans with Disabilities Act or ADA; heating, ventilating, air conditioning, electrical and elevator systems; operational inefficiencies associated with 16 buildings rather than eight and the need for approximately 2 million occupiable square feet.

In order to be achieved, none of these needs requires selection of one of the expensive action alternatives described in the EIS. They can be achieved by the no-action alternative, which is, as I will return and discuss in greater detail, which is only briefly discussed in the EIS.

One, with respect to the ADA, some of the existing buildings are almost fully compliant, and several of the other buildings will need modification. In some cases, the Smith Companies have proposed to make changes at Smith's expense to bring the buildings more fully into compliance, but GSA and PTO have elected not to have that work

djj

33

done.

Second, with regard to fire safety, heating, ventilating, electric and elevator systems, the Smith Companies have offered to make a number of the major needed changes in the Crystal Plaza complex occupied by PTO, but GSA and PTO declined that offer. Smith has agreed to make those changes at its expense if GSA and PTO will extend the affected lease for 5 years. Finally, Smith has already provided GSA and PTO with over \$6 million in 1996 to make improvements to PTO's space.

With respect to building consolidation, the Smith Companies have told GSA and PTO that they would so plan the leases in their buildings as to give the PTO full buildings and reduce the number of buildings from 16 to eight.

Fourth, with respect to space, the Smith Companies have committed to GSA and PTO to make available the full space contemplated by the DEIS within the time frame set out there in full single-user buildings.

djj

34

In short, the very criteria set out in the DEIS' purpose and needs statement show that all of the stated needs can be met under the no action alternative with the ongoing and routine developments described above.

A second deficiency associated with the purpose and need discussion arises out of the constraints imposed by specifications. Basically, under NEPA, an agency can't limit the scope of its consideration of alternatives by self-imposed limitations, but for reasons which we have submitted to you in writing, in this case, the PTO appears to have done exactly that. The effect is to stack the deck against the use of existing buildings, hardly the encouragement of re-use, which NEPA and its implementing regulations favor.

2-2

The third structural failing under NEPA is the inadequate discussion of the no-action alternative, and I might say, just picking up on some of the testimony that you have heard from others in the audience today, it does seem worthwhile to point out that the no-action

djj

35

alternative would serve both the goals of those who have doubts about the Eisenhower Valley sites and those who are concerned about impacts on the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Basically, with respect to the no-action alternative, it is slighted. It's given less than half a page, while the three action alternatives get 23 pages. The NEPA requirement is to rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and that, frankly, has not been met with the no-action alternative. And finally, with respect to significant NEPA deficiencies, the discussion of alternatives, which includes a brief discussion of extend current leases, is also inadequate, for much the same reasons.

3-1

The second major deficiency of this DEIS relates to its discussion of hazardous waste. The Carlyle site does have a fairly thorough discussion of some of the hazardous waste problems, which it raises but never addresses and never comes to solutions. While portions of the Carlyle site have

9.3-1

djj

36

been remediated, one block of it, said to have been not yet documented as evaluated, and indeed, sampling shows the presence of PCBs.

Another area, covering portions of two blocks, is also described as not having been examined and sampled for hazardous materials. After discussing some limited remediation and various things that were come across, including gas cylinders, inert, unexploded ordnance, storage dumps and tanks, the comment is made it is unknown whether these items were removed. The DEIS itself says it's not clear that all potentially contaminated areas are being addressed in the developer's assessment.

9.3-9

The Eisenhower site, while getting less mention in the DEIS, has its share of contamination worries as well. In the words of the DEIS, the nature and extent of dumping activities of the Eisenhower Avenue site remain a concern.

9.3-1

9.3-8

At the request of the Smith Companies, an initial review was conducted in the short period involved by SCS Engineers, environmental

djj

37

consultants who have done considerable work in the Eisenhower Valley area before. They say that cleanup levels for the Carlyle site appear to have been based on the absence of groundwater contamination, but the groundwater is, in fact contaminated.

9.3-2

The proposed PTO construction at the Carlyle site, if it is found to be hazardous, would require an excavation and treatment of an amount of soil which could cost in the range of \$60 million to treat. US EPA approval of PCB cleanup plans appears to be lacking. The Carlyle site is also a candidate for open-dump regulatory treatment under the Virginia solid waste management regulations.

9.3-3

9.3-5

With respect to the Eisenhower site, uncontrolled waste disposal has occurred at all three parcels, and disposal of hazardous waste at that site, if, on further testing, the soil appears to be contaminated, could cost well over \$100 million.

9.3-4

9.3-8

9.3-7

Traffic: the third major area of deficiency in the DEIS relates to traffic. One

djj

38

need only read some of the recent coverage in the Washington Post concerning the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, which is described by the Maryland transportation secretary as the major bottleneck on the East Coast. Traffic loads are more than twice capacity. Now, two proposals, Carlyle and Eisenhower Avenue, are put forward which will further overburden an already overburdened system.

8.1-3

Here, let me refer back to the draft EIS on the Naval Systems Command consolidation, written in the early nineties, when traffic was not as congested as it is today, which estimated traffic mitigation at \$130 million for the Eisenhower Avenue site. The current DEIS recommends \$14.6 million. To say this disparity invites questioning is grossly to understate the case. What has happened to the other well over \$100 million? The 1992 SDEIS refers to queues extending from the Woodrow Wilson Bridge back past and through the Telegraph Road interchange on a frequent basis. Now, they extend even further.

8.7-1

At that time, GSA's SDEIS concluded that

djj

39

even without the Navy project, the roadway system for movement in and out of the eastern end of the Eisenhower Valley will be dysfunctional, close quote. Indeed, the SDEIS concluded that the greatest cumulative impact is related to traffic. The present DEIS simply fails to analyze these cumulative impacts, which is a fatal flaw. Next, and relatedly, the DEIS did not start by analyzing the transportation projects that are needed to bring the road system up to acceptable standard, even before proposing a new project.

8.3-1

8.1-3

These shortcomings have the effect of omitting the discussion of cumulative impacts required by NEPA. We also note one curious omission from the traffic analysis: the absence of data on traffic generation generated by the users of PTO as distinguished from and in addition to that generated by the employees.

8.1-4

- 8.1-5

Finally, and with respect to traffic, the study area slights Old Town Alexandria and its streets and residential areas, especially impacts on Duke Street, Route 1, Washington Street and the

8.1-4

djj

40

George Washington Parkway.

With respect to archaeology, the recommended scheme for handling archaeological impacts does not comport with NEPA. The law is an environmental look before you leap law. First you look; then, you decide. But here, with respect to one of the sites, there is a memorandum of understanding between the City of Alexandria and the developer of the Carlyle site, both proponents of development in the area, and it simply looks to the MOU to resolve issues in the future.

7.1-4

For the other two sites, the DEIS recommends additional phase one testing as mitigation. Again, this turns NEPA on its head. First, you decide, the DEIS would have us believe; then, you test. That's simply wrong under NEPA. First, you test; then, informed by the results, you decide. At the request of the Smith Companies, an initial review was conducted by Joseph Hopkins Associates, and their submission is also attached to our submission as Attachment D.

Both the Carlyle and Eisenhower sites are

djj

41

characterized by fill on low-lying land, which creates a good potential for survival of important archaeological resources beneath the fill. With land use, the next major deficiency relates to lack of compliance with local land use controls, including zoning. The Carlyle site would not satisfy several guidelines, according to the DEIS, of the Duke Street Coordinated Development District. As such, it is inconsistent with applicable zoning requirements. It is also inconsistent with the applicable small area plan and with the National Capital Planning Commission's comprehensive plan policies.

7.1-3

7.1-5

5.2-5

Similarly, the Eisenhower Avenue project would not satisfy several guidelines of the Eisenhower Avenue Coordinated Development District. One of the buildings would exceed what is authorized under the applicable small area plan. This project, too, is inconsistent with zoning requirements and with NCP's comprehensive plan policies.

5.2-8

To conclude, there remains much to be done

djj

42

to bring this DEIS into reviewable form. We pointed specifically to five areas. With respect to the first area of deficiency, the structural failings that follow from an inaccurate statement of purpose and need and which lead to misleading evaluation of alternatives, including the no action alternative, we frankly don't see how the NEPA process can survive an objective evaluation of purpose and need.

The no action alternative can only emerge, no longer a slighted alternative, but as the preferred alternative. With respect to the other four areas of deficiency: hazardous waste, archaeology, traffic, and land use, there is considerably more work to be done before this EIS is ready for review, even in draft form. That's why we have suggested that the law requires a revised DEIS to be prepared and circulated.

Only when the questions posed there are fully addressed, rigorously explored and objectively evaluated, to use the CEQ NEPA regulations phase, will the DEIS be such as to lend

djj

43

itself to fully informed comments.

Again, thank you for your courtesy.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

Ellen Pickering?

MS. PICKERING: Whew!

[Laughter.]

MS. PICKERING: The name is Ellen  
Pickering, P-I-C-K-E-R-I-N-G.

Well, I'm not quite sure where I want to  
begin right now, but let me talk just a little bit  
about the Crystal City site. This site also  
suffers from contaminated soil and ground water  
problems. It is inconsistent with the Arlington  
general land use plan. Fire trucks would have a  
problem getting there. There is no need to worry  
about the economic problem, because it would  
eventually be built out anyway, and whatever  
problem that would occur would be very short-lived.

9.3-1

5.4-2

The major problem and the tragic flaw is  
the building that intrudes upon our Memorial  
Parkway. It's already been mentioned. I can't  
emphasize enough what a travesty that is to the

7.2-2

djj

44

history of our country. And, of course, it's stupid to put it over the railroad. I know they do it in New York City and Pennsylvania and other places, but after all, here we are, next to the Memorial Parkway and in a Crystal City area where there ought to be ample place to put this structure without going over the railroad, where hazardous wastes and materials pass almost daily.

11-1

That's just enough to turn it down flat, as far as I'm concerned.

Now, as far as the Carlyle go, it does have contaminated soil. It is in conflict with the master plan and the small area plan. I'd like to address--come back to that point. It becomes a job center designation, which is contrary to what originally was planned or looked forward to by those of us who worked on the special use program that lays upon the land now.

9.3-1

5.2-4

5.2-5

I say that, but, you know, the City Council has gone ahead and given some approvals that are contingent upon the PTO, but my comments are going to be addressed to the original plan as

djj

45

we foresaw it, and even though there have been continual changes and text amendments and so forth brought in to make this PTO possible, we still would like to revert back to or at least stay as close as we can to the original intent of that site.

The Carlyle site has serious pedestrian problems, and it will take more time to reach the Commerce Department via the shuttle than it would at the Crystal City site, time off for workers. More area of impervious land will be covered. It lacks the bike path plan or even an easy adaptation to our biking plan, and the visual part of it is very, very intrusive, which I would also like to return to.

As far as the Hoffman site goes, the wetlands that are there are not designated serious wetlands. They're swayles for storm water and, therefore, not--they're wet, but they're not considered wetlands. Again, it's a job center destination, but there are no established neighborhoods to pass through to cause a problem of

8.4-1

djj

46

getting there, and if it isn't developed, we will get the taxes eventually, because it will one day be developed. So, I don't buy the argument that Alexandria needs it for the taxes.

You know, the land is going to be built eventually. It will be very easy to design that site to include bike plans such as we have proposed in the city. The height does not impact the Alexandria historical sites or our established neighborhoods. The possible archaeological findings will be very easy to handle. Most of that fill will be found to be, as stated in the EIS, draft EIS, soils from construction, like the Beltway and that kind of thing.

5.2-7

It's low land; would have been marsh land; likely to perhaps show some prehistoric signs of a run down there but unlikely for other historical, archaeological findings. Besides, Alexandria has a very good, very solid department of archaeology. We have--you can just see what we have done in the past. I don't like what we do. I didn't like what we did at the corner of Queen and Lee Streets,

7.1-5

djj

47

where we found these very vitally important sites, and yet, we simply marked them and built on them. We also did that on the Carlyle site.

7.1-3

With Metro, there are no pedestrian problems. It's very easy to flow back and forth with the Eisenhower Metro Station there.

Therefore, the question comes why are there so many parking spaces at the Eisenhower Station?

8.5-1

Now, I'd like to look back a little bit at some of the points and enlarge on some, if I may.

In the city master plan, the goals and objectives, we worked very hard on this, and Lord knows Mr.

5.2-4

Sheldon Linn's office spent years at it to come up with this that we could all agree with, and under the objectives, we had to ensure that new

development is compatible with adjacent or nearby residential neighborhoods. The proposed Carlyle site is not compatible with the adjacent

5.2-6

neighborhoods: not with the adjacent neighborhoods that have just been conducted on the site, because it's not according to what they expected to be board-certified, and it's not compatible with the

djj

48

other residential neighborhoods that are nearby.

Under the policies, it says, in areas designated for mixed-use development, development of parcels of two acres or more shall be residential or mixed use and shall contribute to achieving the mix desired in this area. The amount of office space consumed on this Carlyle site will negate that policy completely.

5.2-4

We also have this, the one which addresses large scale and high-density office concentrations. This is still in the policies. It says large-scale and high-density office concentrations should be limited to designated development potential areas, where high density concentrations are appropriate and where traffic impacts on residential neighborhoods are relatively limited.

5.2-4

Well, this is a high density concentration, and the traffic patterns in the residential neighborhoods will be terribly impacted by this, and it goes on to say these concentrations should be limited to areas served by expressways or arterials and preferably by Metrorail. Well, poor

8.1-4

djj

49

Carlyle. They don't have the Beltway next to them. They don't have Eisenhower Avenue next to them. They've got Duke Street, but that's going to probably the most impossible way to get in and out.

Now, I know the gentleman just mentioned the fact that Route 1, you know, that Crystal City can handle all of the traffic. Well, I want him to know that we've got his traffic coming through us now. So, I don't think that counts.

[Laughter.]

MS. PICKERING: I think that the traffic would stop much faster at the Eisenhower site than it would if it came to either the Carlyle or the Crystal City site. I think we would suffer less. Anybody coming from D.C. who doesn't take the Metrorail who has simply to get off and skip-jump into the office is crazy. Anybody coming up from the south who doesn't either take the Beltway up and get off at Eisenhower Avenue--they have three choices: Van Dorn, Clairmont and Eisenhower, and if they're coming up Route 1, they can get off of Route 1. They get right on Eisenhower Avenue

8.6-1

8.6-2

djj

50

without any problems.

Also, the small area plan: now, the small area plan is very important to us in Alexandria. We hang our hat on this. In the public policy section, it says although two Metro areas were slated for growth, Council was well aware of the locational differences between the two stations: King Street Metro. The King Street Metro area was located near single-family residential area and an historic district. Development was to be encouraged but also to be contained and to protect the nearby neighborhoods. The amount proposed by PTO does not protect us. It does not fit this.

5.2-6

For the Eisenhower Metro, it says--now, remember, we hang our hats on this small area plan in this city--public policy regarding development and zoning around the Eisenhower Avenue Station was focused on encouraging mixed use development. Because of the area's relative isolation from nearby residential areas, there was little apparent reason to constrain development envelopes or heights. And I think that probably fits the

5.2-8

5.2-9

djj

51

proposed Carlyle site--I mean Eisenhower site.

I'd just like to call your attention to the visuals. If you have the visuals of the Carlyle site, the simulations, the view east on Eisenhower Avenue, you can see how it blocks. It's a real block on Eisenhower Avenue. And when you understand, as I believe I understand correctly, there will be no entrance from Eisenhower Avenue. What have you got there? You've got your back side at this thing, sitting on our Eisenhower Avenue that we're trying to develop into an attractive urban corridor? I think that's an insult to us.

7.2-7

If you look at the Carlyle site from the George Washington Masonic Temple, you look down, and you see this massive glob that overtakes the view that today you have of the Potomac River and just down there. Even though there will be development there, it will not be such an enormous glob. This is impenetrable. This has no light or air, no sense of nothing. It's just contrary to any we would hope on that site. It boggles my mind to think that Carlyle people--and I don't know who

7.2-6

djj

52

they are--we know the Smith people, and we know the Hoffman people, but every time Carlyle comes in, they come in with one lawyer or another lawyer, and I never know exactly the bodies they're representing. But whoever they are, they have no taste or sense of what we need or want in Alexandria.

I think if you look at the Eisenhower site simulation, figure 4.4.2.14(b), sure, it looks big; sure, it looks like it takes a lot of space that you don't have. But it doesn't look peculiar.

[Laughter.]

MS. PICKERING: It looks like it might fit.

[Laughter.]

MS. PICKERING: It looks like something you wouldn't be surprised to see along a major thoroughfare like the Beltway or I-66 or something like that. It just--it looks like it belongs. And I think that that, you know, those visuals tell a story right there in themselves.

I did mark some other things. I would

7.2-8

djj

53

just like to turn, since the gentleman from Crystal City talked about the soil, if I could turn this page to the right one. It says here that the following three LRST--and I wrote that down what that means--located on the Crystal City site, a total of five were reported for these three sites, and then, it says Crystal Plaza II, Crystal Plaza III, Crystal Plaza V and VII were listed just a short distance away from the site.

9.3-1

So, you know, that site is not sanctimonious. It's got its problems. I think that they are dealing with some of their leaking sites now. It's currently being remediated through the use of total fluid extraction system and a vapor extraction system for contaminated ground water. But it's not completely clear. It still has its problems. I doubt that they will exist on the Eisenhower site. They could very well exist on the Carlyle site.

I just would like to try to get back. I know that there are others probably waiting to talk. Well, I think that's what I was going to say

djj

54

for now. Probably, as I get a chance to go through this more thoroughly, we'll get some other comments, but it really--it boils down to the Patent and Trademark Office to recognize that they cannot destroy even one quarter of an inch of the GW Parkway. That parkway has to remain as clear and as beautiful as they can do it.

They already infringe now, and I spoke to somebody in the Park Service and asked them how in Sam Hill did you let them light up those buildings which so intrude at night? The reply was we had no idea it was going to be like that. Well, believe me: if they don't figure out how this is going to be now with this new proposal, I think it's time for some people to retire.

7.2-2

[Laughter.]

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

Judy Miller?

MS. MILLER: Thank you; I am Judy Miller of the Rosemont Civic Association, which is neighboring to the area that we are talking about today. Again, it's Judy Miller. I would like to

djj

55

reiterate Mayor Donley's welcome of you to our city. We would be pleased to have you enjoy what we have to offer. It's a charming place, and we would like to make it more charming that you enjoy it.

However, I do differ from the Mayor in the fact that I do have a preference for where I would like for you to locate, and that preference is that I would like to minimize traffic impact on the residential areas lying nearby. The Hoffman site is uniquely situated to minimize traffic, using, as Mayor Donley said, the VRE, the Metro and the Beltway, via access of the Eisenhower conduit.

8.6-1

This does offer alternatives to the Crystal City site, which does not have the traffic conduits in such close proximity to one another. There is new housing going up in the valley, not far away. There are apartments nearby. There is a movie theater going up. There are incentives for small businesses to support your needs and those of your employees. A broad avenue exists as the conduit, as the Eisenhower Avenue conduit attests.

djj

56

Large, broad avenues invite large, tall buildings. They do not impact one another adversely.

There is a stream nearby with jogging and bike trails which abut the avenue. Even for your employees, if you want a breath of fresh air and taking a brown bag lunch outside, you can do so. We've got a stream nearby. I do support the second speaker, who was Bob Jordan of the Carlyle House. He has a problem with the visual impact of your tall buildings, and the traffic volume there would possibly not be conducive to using this Beltway with the Eisenhower access.

7.2-7

Furthermore, the height of the proposed buildings at Carlyle would be a deterrent to our view of our presentation of the emblem to our community, which is the Masonic Temple, and it emulates that of an historic edifice in Egypt. We appreciate the historic nature of the GW Parkway, so why violate its image by building so close to it?

7.2-6

As for the idea that the Woodrow Wilson Bridge would be a deterrent to any of the sites in

8.1-3

djj

57

Alexandria, I find that rather strange, because we're not moving to the other side of the river. I don't think PTO anticipates that Alexandria is on the other side of the river. The blockage of the sites of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge is the same blockage to Crystal City that exists today. We are all on the same side of the river. So, it's not any different from what it would be today.

Other than that, I guess that's it in a nutshell, and I thank you for your participation, and I hope that you will decide on our sites that we have supported for you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

There's one more. Bill Hard?

MR. HARD: I'll pass; thank you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Then, we're back to Michael Perrine.

MR. PERINE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael Perine, that's P-E-R-I-N-E. I'm representing Hoffman Management tonight. I simply have one comment for the record, and that is with respect to the comments made by

djj

58

Mr. Yost about the environmental conditions on our site.

I would have to simply say this: he is full of baloney.

[Laughter.]

MR. PERINE: We have no contaminants anywhere on our site, as confirmed by both a phase one and a phase two site assessment submitted to GSA, and we also will be submitting to GSA by May 26 comprehensive written comments on the draft EIS.

9.3-1

Thank you.

MS. PICKERING: May I ask, is there anyone here from the Carlyle site? Not residents, I mean people--

1-2

MR. HARD: Yes, developers, right here.

MS. PICKERING: Okay; who are you?

[Laughter.]

MR. HARD: Would you like my name, my card?

MS. PICKERING: I've never heard of you before.

MR. HARD: My name is Bill Hard. This is

djj

59

Tim Reid.

MS. PICKERING: Thank you.

[Inaudible.]

MS. PICKERING: I know Mr. Middleton, who was always talking for you.

MR. HARD: Mr. Middleton does not speak for us. We have not--

VOICE: Though he's a very nice man.

MR. HARD: Yes, he is.

MS. PICKERING: I know, but sometimes--

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Excuse me; are there any more--was there another sheet with sign-in names?

[No response.]

MR. KAMEROW: I signed the sheet.

VOICE: I signed the sheet.

VOICE: As did I.

MR. KAMEROW: And said yes.

VOICE: And I had a question mark.

MR. KAMEROW: I had a yes.

VOICE: And I had a not sure.

VOICE: Try the back of that one.

djj

60

VOICE: It was the same sheet as Bob Jordan signed.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: I don't see any, but you can come up and speak; I don't care. It's just that I don't have it on my list.

[Laughter.]

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Please come up and state your name.

MR. KAMEROW: I did sign.

My name is Allan, A-L-L-A-N, Kamerow, K-A-M-E-R-O-W. I am a resident of Carlyle and live in the East Building on the top floor. I have been a resident of Alexandria for 48 years and had the privilege of serving on the Planning Commission for 20 years, starting in the early seventies.

First of all, I would like to say that I will keep my remarks brief, and this has to do with environmental impact, and those are the two words that I will use in my brief remarks. First of all, I'm not familiar with the Arlington site. So, I won't address that. I didn't study their plan. I am familiar with the other two sites, particularly

djj

61

with Carlyle, because back in the early seventies, we had this piece of ground, and we didn't know what to do with it in the City of Alexandria, and the height limitation there was then 88 feet for the whole thing, and that's what was going to be developed until we came up with the idea of enticing the Federal court to come over there, which came to fruition.

And then, I and a couple of the young-- well, younger--Turks on the commission said listen, instead of doing this, why don't we put a ring of high-rises around the periphery of the property and use the middle for a park, green land, something like, you know, Central Park or Fanueil Park in Boston, whatever.

Well, we were pipe-dreaming. Now, we realize that, because we spent a lot of time talking about a theater for the performing arts and an ice skating rink and an aquarium, but soon, we realized that the owner of the property found that the price of the property was so dear that it had to go for something that would mean more to the

djj

62

owner.

Now, concerning Carlyle, I feel very strongly that the economic and environmental impact will be very severe, not only because I would look out of my window on the 20th floor, and in my front yard, I would see four 16-story buildings plus a 29-story tower that would tower eight stories over my 20th-story condo, and I don't think that Judge Bryan would be very happy looking out of his chambers up eight stories to the top of the tower at the end of the proposed campus for the PTO.

7.2-7

Now, I am not opposed to the PTO coming to Alexandria. Frankly, we need the money; we've got the space. But it's not the Carlyle space. I think probably the greatest impact would be the traffic. People, and certainly the developers, don't seem to realize that in a couple of years, we're going to have a total of between 1,500 and 2,000 residents in the Carlyle Towers in the three buildings.

8.4-2

Now, that's a lot of people and a lot of cars to impact with the huge mega-metropolis in the

djj

63

center of the campus right across the street. The traffic on Duke Street, as someone observed before, is getting worse and worse. Less than two years ago, the city widened the bridge and rebuilt the bridge just adjacent and just west of the Carlyle property. That is not going to last long, because when you start pouring out all of the cars from both Carlyle, the 2,000 residents in Carlyle and 3,500 people from the PTO, many of which will come out to Duke Street, it's going to be a real, tremendous traffic impact.

8.1-4

Also, I'm not only complaining because I'm a resident, and this is all going to be in my front yard. I'm complaining because I'm an old-time citizen of Alexandria. We call this an all-American city, which it has won an honor for many times. We think that it is an all-world city; it's great. And I'm not sure that people will be happy. Certainly, the residents of Alexandria wouldn't be happy, and I don't think PTO would be happy to drive through those two lions and look at this huge--and I love Mrs. Pickering's word--massive

7.2-7

djj

64

glob of concrete and steel facing you as you come between the two lions.

It doesn't present itself, it seems to me, to the Patent Office or to visitors to town in the way an all-American city should; certainly, we know that ultimately, something is going to go on that ground, and it's not going to be an aquarium or an ice skating rink. It's going to be some structures. But somebody has got to come up with a better plan, with a better idea as to how to treat that land.

5.2-6

I look at traffic as being really the most serious impact, because there, you have not only the backing up of cars from Washington Street up Duke Street all the way to Quaker Lane three or four times a week going down toward the river, which is going to get so much worse, but it's all the exhaust coming from there, and boy, if that isn't environmental, what is? You know, thousands of cars sending their exhaust up into the air; I think this would be really a terrible thing.

8.1-4

Now, as with the Hoffman site, I have

djj

65

studied their plan, and, you know, I've heard for years when I was on the Planning Commission I don't want this in my back yard, and we're not saying that we don't want this in our front yard just because it affects us. We think that the Hoffman site would better serve everybody. It's on the other side of Eisenhower Avenue. It's between that and the Beltway. There is no residential there and never will be, whereas, on the Carlyle site, you would have hundreds and hundreds of people staring into windows across the street.

There would be a tremendous impact, and as between Carlyle and Hoffman, I would urge you to give serious thought to putting your building on the Hoffman site.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Well, thank you.

Now, there was another hand over here?

MR. WHITNEY: I'm Ray Whitney, and I, too, live at the Carlyle.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Could you spell your last name?

5.1-1

djj

66

MR. WHITNEY: W-H-I-T-N-E-Y.

But unlike Allan, I've never lived anywhere for 40 years, and I've been in Alexandria for about a year, and we selected the Carlyle as a place to live, like a lot of the other residents did, because of what we've been throwing around as a real technical term called a mixed-use neighborhood. The mixed-use neighborhood to me, when you bring it down to common terms, I lived in apartments in New York City most of my childhood, and we had real mixed-use neighborhoods. We had businesses; we had residences; we had shops; we had storekeepers.

That kind of an environment creates a living neighborhood. I would challenge you folks tonight on your way out of Alexandria to go over to the Carlyle site and look there, because at 9:00 tonight or whatever time we get out of here, you'll see just how dead a community could possibly be and how little traffic there is there.

If we put the PTO in the center of that site, it's going to be just as dead at 7:00, 8:00

djj

67

and 9:00 every night, and that's not a mixed-use neighborhood; that's not a living neighborhood; that's not what any of us want. That's not what Old Town is. Old Town is mixed use; Old Town is living, vibrant; tourists come to see it. Tourists aren't coming to see the PTO in the center of the Carlyle.

5.2-5

That space, though, in front of the Carlyle or the proposed site for PTO obviously provides, in my mind, a great area for a support system to support the buildings if placed on the Hoffman site. It could provide the restaurants, the smaller office space for other companies that have to support PTO in a friendly environment, and if the ratio of office to residential is maintained, it could easily provide a good residential community for the people who do work at PTO, and it would even cut down more of the traffic, smog, pollution problems that we already have.

5.1-1

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

djj

68

Now, are there any other people who didn't get to talk who would like to come up here and testify?

MR. HARD: What the heck.

[Pause.]

MR. HARD: My name is Bill Hard, H-A-R-D, and perhaps to clarify some misconceptions, we are the contract purchaser of the proposed PTO site at Carlyle, and I would like to agree with the gentleman from Hoffman's sentiments relative to the environmental status of our site. We've spent a lot of time, money and effort looking at that in conjunction with Norfolk Southern; have prepared and, we think, submitted the appropriate documents to GSA, and we will continue to work with GSA if any questions arise, which we don't think there are any.

9.3-9

1-2

Relative to making our plans available to those who have spoken this evening, rather than trying to counter or discuss in this forum our opinions as to design, mixed-use development and traffic, I would like to make a standing offer. I

djj

69

brought lots of business cards tonight. We have made a couple of presentations to different associations in the neighborhood of Carlyle and have an open invitation to people tonight to continue to do so to, I think, accurately and fully explain our plans.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Thank you.

Anybody else?

[No response.]

CHAIRMAN WINTERS: Then, I think we're adjourned. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 9:04 p.m., the meeting was concluded.]

- - -